



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/451,592	11/30/1999	KRISHNA MANGIPUDI	20496/2	9253

7590 01/22/2004

BRIAN L MICHEALIS ESQ
BROWN RUDNICK FREED & GESMER
18TH FLOOR
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THU HA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 01/22/2004

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/451,592

Applicant(s)

MANGIPUDI ET AL.

Examiner

Thu Ha T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/13/03.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on November 13, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

3. Applicants argue that Bhoj does not teach or suggest the step of defining classes of back end servers, defining classes of service for at least one of host system, user, URL, hosted site, transaction, content and file type, and defining classes of service parameters according to a hierarchy of service levels. Examiner asserts that Bhoj does teach or suggest the step of defining classes of back end servers, defining classes of service for at least one of host system, user, URL, hosted site, transaction, content and file type, and defining classes of service parameters according to a hierarchy of service levels as shown in figures 2-3, col. 4 lines 39-col. 6 lines 14, col. 6 lines 63-col. 10 lines 7.

4. Applicants argue that neither Bhoj nor Fletcher teach a collection processor measuring and periodically collecting a set of defined parameters for said at least one back-end servers. In response to Applicants' argument, Examiner asserts that Bhoj does teach a collection processor measuring and periodically collecting a set of defined parameters for said at least one back-end servers as shown in cols. 5-6 lines 65-34 and col. 7 lines 22-col. 10 lines 7, col. 11 lines 24-40 and col. 15 lines 7-18.

Art Unit: 2155

5. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that cited prior arts teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, 6, and 9. Claims 2-5, 7-8, and 10-16 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in the previous office action [see paper no. 11].

Accordingly, claims 1-16 are respectfully rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5, and 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bhoj et al** (hereinafter Bhoj) U.S. Patent No. **6,304,892**.

8. Regarding claim 1, **Bhoj** discloses a method comprising steps of:
defining classes of service for at least one of host system, user, URL, hosted site, transaction, content and file type (see figures 2, 5, NEWS SERVERS, E-MAIL SERVERS, WEB SERVER FARM, col. 9 lines 19-col. 10 lines 7);

defining a set of parameters to be measured for each of said classes (col. 4 lines 39-col. 6 lines 14, col. 6 lines 63-col. 10 lines 7);

defining acceptance levels for each of parameters in said set of parameters (col. 5 lines 65-col. 6 lines 61, col. 7 lines 22-col. 10 lines 7);

collecting real-time information related to measurement of said parameters (col. 11 lines 24-40 and col. 15 lines 7-18); and

comparing said acceptance levels to said real-time information (col. 11 lines 41-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made that **Bhoj** implicitly discloses the service management system 31a-33a defines or selects classes of back-end server (e.g., payroll, printing, e-mail server host) based on the data service components being managed (e.g., e-mail, printing...) (see figures 1-2, 4-5, NEWS SERVERS, E-MAIL SERVERS, WEB SERVER FARM, col. 9 lines 19-col. 10 lines 7) equivalent to the step of defining classes of back-end server that disclosed in the applicant's specification. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that **Bhoj** performs the same function in substantially the same way to reach substantially the same result.

9. Regarding claim 2, **Bhoj** discloses the step of defining further includes the steps of: providing a format in which a set of servers will provide information to be measured (cols. 9-10 lines 62-7); and implementing means for collecting said information (col. 11 lines 29-35).

10. Regarding claim 3, **Bhoj** discloses generating a database entry for each service commitment element of a service level agreement (cols. 11-12 lines 66-6).

Art Unit: 2155

11. Regarding claims 4 and 12, **Bhoj** discloses the set of parameters to be measured is selected from the set consisting of records of performance, errors, client IP address, username, date, time, service, server name, server IP address, processing time, bytes sent, bytes received, service status, operation, target URL, User Agent, referrer parameters, and cookie (cols. 8-9 lines 38-24).

12. Regarding claims 5 and 13, **Bhoj** discloses the real-time information collected further includes information selected from the group consisting of assigned disk space, that the user can access, how the user's request is fulfilled within the system or web farm, user's subscribed level of service or class, transaction, number of requests, download size, file size, file type, time of day, week or month, response time of the back end servers', response time of the web farm, and how long it takes to complete a specified request or file (col. 9 lines 25-52).

13. Regarding claim 9, **Bhoj** discloses a method comprising steps of:
defining classes of service parameters according to a hierarchy of service levels (see fig. 2, NEWS SERVERS, E-MAIL SERVERS, WEB SERVER FARM, col. 7 lines 14-21);

selecting at least one of service parameters to be monitored (col. 12 lines 61-67);
creating a database of monitored service parameters (cols. 11 lines 5-6); and
preparing reports and/or alarms according to said selected at least one class of service parameters (col. 14 lines 39-44 and col. 15 lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made that **Bhoj** implicitly discloses the service management system 31a-33a defines or selects classes of back-end server (e.g., payroll, printing, e-mail server host) based on the data service components being managed (e.g., e-mail, printing...) (see figures 1-2, 4-5, NEWS SERVERS, E-MAIL SERVERS, WEB SERVER FARM, col. 9 lines 19-col. 10 lines 7) equivalent to the step of defining classes of back-end server that disclosed in the applicant's specification. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that **Bhoj** performs the same function in substantially the same way to reach substantially the same result.

14. Regarding claim 10, **Bhoj** discloses a graphical user interface for performing at least one of selecting the class of service parameters to be monitored, defining thresholds of service-level commitments for at least some of said service parameters, defining alarm trigger events, scheduling monitoring and reporting functions, and determining reporting formats (see fig. 10, col.12 lines 61-67, col. 14 lines 39-44, col. 15 lines 25-34).

15. Regarding claim 11, **Bhoj** discloses preparing reports and /alarms is further based on thresholds, schedules, and formats defined by the graphical user interface (col. 15 lines 25-34).

16. Regarding claim 14, **Bhoj** discloses said class of service parameters are selected according to user class, host class, and virtual site class (col. 13 lines 15-19).

17. Regarding claims 15 and 16, **Bhoj** discloses defining classes is based on one of users, URLs and virtual sites (see fig. 2, NEWS SERVERS, E-MAIL SERVERS, WEB SERVER FARM) (col. 7 lines 14-21).

18. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bhoj et al** (hereinafter Bhoj) U.S. Patent No. **6,304,892**, in view of Fletcher et al., (hereinafter Fletcher) U.S. Patent No. **6,269,401**.

19. Regarding claim 6, **Bhoj** discloses an apparatus comprising:
at least one back-end servers and reporter (figures 1-2, 4-5, see fig. 2, NEWS SERVERS, E-MAIL SERVERS, WEB SERVER FARM, col. 9 lines 19-col. 10 lines 7) and reporter (figure 7);

a network connecting said at least one back-end servers and a reporter (figures 1-2, 4-5, 7 NEWS SERVERS, E-MAIL SERVERS, WEB SERVER FARM, col. 9 lines 19-col. 10 lines 7);

a collection processor measuring and periodically collecting a set of defined parameters for said at least one back-end servers (cols. 5-6 lines 65-34 and col. 7 lines 22-col. 10 lines 7, col. 11 lines 24-40 and col. 15 lines 7-18);

wherein said acceptance levels depend on at least one of a class of service for at least one of host system, URL, hosted site, transaction, content, file type and user (figures 2, 5, col. 9 lines 19-col. 10 lines 7);

However, **Bhoj** does not teach a set of acceptance levels for said collected parameters, a monitoring processor determining which of said collected parameters exceed a corresponding acceptance level, and a reporting process that produces a report results of said monitoring processor. **Fletcher** teaches a set of acceptance levels for said collected parameters (fig. 3 col. 6 lines 26-34, col. 8 lines 7-col. 9 lines 30, col. 22 lines 67-col. 23 lines 7, col. 23 lines 55-col. 26 lines 65); a monitoring processor determining which of said collected parameters exceed a corresponding acceptance level (col. 23 lines 16-col. 25 lines 39); and a reporting process that produces a report results of said monitoring processor (col. 25 lines 27-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Bhoj and Fletcher** to have a set of acceptance levels corresponding to said collected parameters, a monitoring processor determining which of said collected parameters exceed a corresponding acceptance level, and a reporting process that produces a report results of said monitoring processor because it would have an efficient communication system that can monitor a communication network and enable to detect a problem and determine the cause of the problem and report to the network manager.

20. Regarding claim 7, **Fletcher** teaches monitoring a set of defined parameters and logging them into respective log files (col. 6 lines 40-43); scheduler triggering said reporter to begin collection of log files from a list of back-end server (col. 8 lines 735); an accumulator requesting log files from the intelligent agent of each listed backend server and consolidating the log files into a database (cols. 24-25 lines 51-26); an interface mechanism between said accumulator and each of intelligent agent (figures 3, 8, col. 24 lines 51-col. 25 lines 39), said interface mechanism ensuring that each requested log file is completely transferred to the accumulator prior to starting consolidation (col. 25 lines 3-26).

21. Regarding claim 8, **Fletcher** teaches keeps track of which portions of said log files have been transferred (col. 24 lines 29-50).

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2155

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Ha Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-7447. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8:00AM – 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Thu Ha Nguyen

January 16, 2004



HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER